REMARKS

Claim 32 was rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Osawa.

However, claim 32 calls for a control to receive one of at least two states and to change the impedance of the selectively variable impedance to signal said state.

In Osawa, the asserted impedance adjusting circuit is the circuit 11 which is shown in Figure 3 at the bottom of the figure. It is shown there that a control signal is supplied by the transistor Q3. The control signal is either 2.5 volts or 1.69 volts. When 2.5 volts is supplied, the cassette player is operated and when 1.69 volts is supplied, the cassette player does not operate. See Osawa at column 3, lines 28-39.

A review of the circuit shown in Figure 3 shows that Figure 11 has no variable impedance. It is made up of resistances which are not indicated to be variable. Thus, the circuit is static and is never varied or changed.

Therefore, there is not a selectively variable impedance. There is no control to receive one of at least two states and to change the impedance of the variable impedance or to signal a state. The signaling of a state is all done by the circuit 10 which merely supplies a voltage to the passive circuit 11. That voltage indicates whether or not the cassette player should be operated or not.

On the same basis, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 35 is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 38, there is no impedance level detector. Nor is there any interface coupled to the detector to change the operation of the device based on the information provided by the level detector.

Instead, in Osawa, the choice of operational state is all done within the circuit 10 and then that is simply supplied to the circuit 11. In either 10 or 11 there is no impedance level detector or any interface coupled to such a detector that changes the operation of the device "based on information provided by an impedance level detector."

With respect to the assertion of well known art, the Examiner is specifically requested to cite a reference which supports the applicability of a reference level detector to change the operation of a device based on information provided by the impedance level detector. To the extent that no such operation can be found within the prior art, the patent application should be in condition for allowance. Thus, even if impedance level detectors were known, nothing in Osawa

teaches any reason to use an impedance level detector to signal the state. Resistors are known too, but that does not provide any reason to use resistors, to change their resistance value, and to use that resistance value change to change the operation of a device. Moreover, as set forth in claim 41, there is nothing which suggests using an impedance level to indicate a play state.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 1, 2005

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation